

The introduction

Wind power is better than nuclear power because it is cleaner.

Wind power is better than nuclear power because it is clean from inception to decommissioning whereas nuclear power involves mining uranium as well as the storage of spent nuclear fuel rods for millennia.

During the lifetime of a nuclear reactor, it is generally considered a clean way of generating electricity. In this, wind and nuclear power vary little, however if consideration is given to the construction and decommissioning of wind turbines and nuclear generators, it becomes obvious that wind power would win any argument of choice, hands down.

When thinking about whether to commission a nuclear or wind power plant, there is really no argument at all. Wind power must win, hands down, as it has demonstrated itself to be the only true proponent of clean energy when the construction and decommissioning stages of the plant's life are taken into consideration.

As the only true proponent of clean energy, wind is a better choice than nuclear power when it comes to considering future options for power generation.

Wind power has many advantages over other technologies as it:

- is a consistent source of energy;
- is a clean fuel;
- produces no greenhouse gas emissions;
- is reliable and needs minimal maintenance;
- provides cheap electricity.

It has been suggested, mainly by ill-educated opponents of wind power, that nuclear would be a better source of energy. Although nuclear power is currently providing 13% of the world's energy, it does eventually need decommissioning. What do wind opponents suggest that we do with the spent fuel rods of plutonium?

No one has really come up with a satisfactory solution to the problem of storing nuclear waste and indeed, a BBC study in 2008 suggested that closing the Sellafield Nuclear Reactor would probably cost in excess of £73 billion which puts the cost each kilowatt hour generated by these plants at an astronomical level. Couple with this is the possibility of a nuclear accident and people who argue that nuclear is best are left in the cold when it comes to an indepth understanding of the issues. They would suggest that

nuclear power is safe but we could cite the examples of Chernobyl, Fukushima and Three Mile Island where things have gone badly wrong. (There are many cases of less serious nuclear accidents which have been omitted for the purposes of clarity).

People sometimes complain about the construction of wind farms as being, 'hideous monstrosities on the landscape.' This is an appreciable argument if you have your view altered by living near a wind farm but which would you prefer: a wind farm accident or a nuclear one?

Consequently, taking into account the poor safety record of the alternatives and the cost of decommissioning, it is suggested that wind farms are better for the environment; better for consistent energy provision and better for you.

